



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,530	01/23/2004	Luis Felipe Cabrera	13768.475	9223
47973 7590 02/19/2009 WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT 1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111				
EXAMINER TAYLOR, NICHOLAS R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2441				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/19/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/763,530

Applicant(s)

CABRERA ET AL.

Examiner

Nicholas Taylor

Art Unit

2441

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-23, 25-31, 33-37 and 40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-23, 25-31, 33-37 and 40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 January 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-23, 25-31, 33-37, and 40 have been presented for examination and are rejected.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed November 17th, 2008, have been fully considered but they are deemed not persuasive. Arguments not addressed are limited to those that are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

3. In the remarks, applicant argued in substance that:

(A) The prior art of Thebaut does not teach processing rules at the time the incoming message is received. Instead, Thebaut resolves conflicts among rules at the time the policy framework is established and the rules are defined.

As to point (A), Thebaut teaches the application of prioritization mechanisms that guarantee only a single rule will prevail in the case of conflicting rules (col. 4, lines 26-62, col. 10, line 59 to col. 11, line 2, and col. 11, lines 4-20). A conflict resolution strategy is used to determine proper processing. Some basic rule conflicts can be resolved at the time the policy framework is established (see col. 4, lines 39-43 "before runtime" including avoiding overlapping rule packages and running validation

algorithms), however, Thebaut teaches a primary conflict resolution mechanism that solves rule conflicts at the time the incoming data is received (see col. 4, lines 44-63 "during runtime" dynamic process; see also col. 6, line 49 to col. 7, line 28 and fig. 6 architecture describing some of the triggers that engages conflict resolution).

Claim Objections

4. Claims 1, 18, 23, 28, 37, 38, and 40 are objected to because of the following minor informality: enclosing the SOAP acronym in parenthesis after the initial introduction. Appropriate correction is required.
5. Claims 1 and 28 recite "configure guarantee." Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
7. Claim 25 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, claim 25 depends on cancelled claim 24. For the purpose of this office action, it is interpreted that the claim correctly depends on claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 3-23, 25-31, 33-37, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thebaut et al. (U.S. Patent 5,889,953) and Kuznetsov et al. (U.S. PGPub 2006/0265689).

10. As per claims 1 and 28, Thebaut teaches a computing system that is capable of dispatching Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) envelope for processing by groups of one or more software methods, a method for the computing system to perform deterministic rule-based dispatch of the SOAP envelope to a group of one or more software methods for further processing, the dispatch being deterministic and resulting in a single rule despite the existence of multiple rules that conflict regarding where the SOAP envelope should be dispatched, the method comprising the following: (Thebaut, col. 3, lines 17-60, fig. 1, and col. 17, lines 7-45; where a deterministic rule-based dispatch is made to dispatch data to executable software methods for processing, see also example dispatch of col. 14, lines 48 to col. 15, line 16 and fig. 15)

an act the computer system accessing a SOAP envelope that is to be dispatched to one or more software methods for processing; (Thebaut, see, e.g., col. 3, lines 35-53 and col. 14, lines 48 to col. 15, line 16, where data is accessed/received over a network)

subsequent to the act of accessing the SOAP envelope, an act of the computer system evaluating a list of rules to identify a plurality of rules that apply to the dispatch of the SOAP envelope, each of the plurality of rules specifying a condition and a group

of one or more software methods the SOAP envelope should be dispatched to if the condition is met; (Thebaut, col. 3, lines 45-60, col. 4, lines 1-25, figs. 1-col. 14, line 48 to col. 15, line 16)

subsequent to the act of evaluating the list of rules, an act of the computing system resolving the plurality of rules utilizing one or more prioritizing mechanisms, wherein at least one prioritizing mechanism is configured guarantee only a single rule will prevail in the case of conflicting rules to identify a single prevailing rule that will be applied for the dispatch of the SOAP envelope, wherein only the single prevailing rule will be applied for the dispatch of the SOAP envelope to the group of one or more software methods; and (Thebaut, col. 4, lines 26-62, col. 10, line 59 to col. 11, line 2, and col. 11, lines 4-20, where a single prevailing rule is applied for dispatch after resolution; see also col. 6, line 49 to col. 7, line 28 and fig. 6 architecture describing some of the triggers that engages conflict resolution)

an act of the computing system dispatching the SOAP envelope to the group of one or more software methods specified by the single prevailing rule (Thebaut, see, e.g., col. 3, lines 35-53; col. 14, lines 48 to col. 15, line 16; and col. 14, lines 48 to col. 15, line 16, where a dispatch is effected based on the single prevailing rule).

However, Thebaut fails to teach the use of the SOAP protocol.

Kuznetsov teaches the use of Simple Object Access Protocol envelopes (e.g., paragraph 0063, 0065, 0082, 0091, and 0142) and XPATH rule-based statements (paragraphs 0028-0030) in a network message processing system that relies on the use of rules (paragraph 0056).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Thebaut and Kuznetsov to provide the network system of Kuznetsov in the system of Thebaut, because doing so would allow efficient XML markup processing compatibility in a network rules system and widen the system format capabilities (e.g., see Kuznetsov paragraphs 0021-0023 and 0025). Further, the use of SOAP processing can efficiently interconnect enterprise applications at a lower cost than conventional proprietary protocol solutions (see Kuznetsov, paragraph 0013).

11. As per claims 3 and 33, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the act of resolving the plurality of rules to identify a single prevailing rule comprises the following: an act of applying a first prioritization mechanism (Thebaut, col. 4, lines 26-62, col. 10, line 59 to col. 11, line 2, and col. 11, line 4-20, 34-44, and 50-65, where a prioritization mechanism is applied).

12. As per claim 4, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the first prioritization mechanism is selected from the group consisting of: an express dominance mechanism, a prioritization level mechanism, and a unique identifier comparison mechanism (Thebaut, col. 4, lines 26-62, col. 10, line 59, where a variety of prioritization mechanisms are detailed).

13. As per claims 5 and 34, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the application of the first prioritization mechanism narrows the plurality of rules to the

single prevailing rule (Thebaut, col. 4, lines 26-62, col. 10, line 59 to col. 11, line 2, and col. 11, lines 4-20, where a single prevailing rule is applied).

14. As per claim 6, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the application of the first prioritization mechanism guarantees that only one single rule will prevail under any circumstances from the plurality of rules (Thebaut, col. 4, lines 26-62, col. 10, line 59 to col. 11, line 2, and col. 11, lines 4-20, where a single prevailing rule is applied).

15. As per claim 7, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the act of resolving the plurality of rules to identify a prevailing rule further comprises the following: an act of determining that the application of the first prioritization mechanism still resulted in more than one rule; and in response, an act of applying a second prioritization mechanism (Thebaut, col. 4, lines 26-62, col. 10, line 59 to col. 11, line 2, and col. 11, lines 4-20, 34-44, and 50-56, where a single prevailing rule is applied after subsequent prioritization iterations).

16. As per claim 8, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the second prioritization mechanism is selected from the group consisting of: an express dominance mechanism, a prioritization level mechanism, and a unique identifier comparison mechanism (Thebaut, col. 4, lines 26-62, col. 10, line 59, where a variety of prioritization mechanisms are detailed).

17. As per claim 9, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the application of the second prioritization mechanism narrows the plurality of rules to the single prevailing rule (Thebaut, col. 4, lines 26-62, col. 10, line 59 to col. 11, line 2, and col. 11, lines 4-20, 34-44, and 50-56, where a single prevailing rule is applied).

18. As per claim 10, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the application of the second prioritization mechanism guarantees that only one single rule will prevail under any circumstances from the plurality of rules (Thebaut, col. 4, lines 26-62, col. 10, line 59 to col. 11, line 2, and col. 11, lines 4-20, where a single prevailing rule is applied).

19. As per claim 11, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the act of resolving the plurality of rules to identify a prevailing rule further comprises the following: an act of determining that the application of the second prioritization mechanism still resulted in more than one rule; and in response, an act of applying a third prioritization mechanism (Thebaut, col. 4, lines 26-62, col. 10, line 59 to col. 11, line 2, and col. 11, lines 4-20, 34-44, and 50-56, where a single prevailing rule is applied after subsequent prioritization iterations).

20. As per claim 12, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the third prioritization mechanism is selected from the group consisting of: an express

dominance mechanism, a prioritization level mechanism, and a unique identifier comparison mechanism (Thebaut, col. 4, lines 26-62, col. 10, line 59, where a variety of prioritization mechanisms are detailed).

21. As per claim 13, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the application of the third prioritization mechanism narrows the plurality of rules to the single prevailing rule (Thebaut, col. 4, lines 26-62, col. 10, line 59 to col. 11, line 2, and col. 11, lines 4-20, 34-44, and 50-56, where a single prevailing rule is applied after subsequent prioritization iterations).

22. As per claim 14, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the application of the third prioritization mechanism guarantees that only one rule will prevail under any circumstances from the plurality of rules (Thebaut, col. 4, lines 26-62, col. 10, line 59 to col. 11, line 2, and col. 11, lines 4-20, where a single prevailing rule is applied).

23. As per claim 15, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein application of the third prioritization mechanism does not narrow the plurality of rules to the prevailing rule, the method further comprising the following: an act of continuing application of prioritization rules until the plurality of rules is narrowed down to just the single prevailing rule (Thebaut, col. 4, lines 26-62, col. 10, line 59 to col. 11, line 2, and col. 11, lines 4-20 and 34-56, where a single prevailing rule is applied).

24. As per claim 16, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the group of one or more software methods comprises a single method (Thebaut, see, e.g., col. 3, lines 25-60, fig. 1, and col. 14, line 48 to col. 15, line 16 that includes single methods).

25. As per claim 17, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the group of one or more software methods comprises a temporally-ordered chain of a plurality of software methods (Thebaut, see, e.g., col. 3, lines 25-60, fig. 1, and col. 14, line 48 to col. 15, line 16, that includes temporally-ordered chains of methods).

26. As per claim 18, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the SOAP envelope structure is a first SOAP envelope, the plurality of rules is a first plurality of rules, the prevailing rule is a first prevailing rule, and the group of one or more method is a first group of one or more software methods, the method further comprising the following: an act of accessing a second SOAP envelope that is to be processed; (Thebaut, col. 3, lines 17-60, fig. 1, and col. 17, lines 7-45; see also example dispatch of col. 14, line 48 to col. 15, line 16)

subsequent to the act of accessing a second SOAP envelope, an act of evaluating the list of rules to identify a second plurality of rules that apply to the dispatch of the second SOAP envelope, each of the second plurality of rules specifying a different group of one or more software methods to which the SOAP envelope should

be dispatched; (Thebaut, col. 3, lines 45-60, col. 4, lines 1-25, figs. 1-col. 14, line 48 to col. 15, line 16)

subsequent to the act of evaluating the list of rules, an act of resolving the second plurality of rules to identify a single second prevailing rule that will be applied for the dispatch of the second SOAP envelope; and (Thebaut, col. 4, lines 26-62, col. 10, line 59 to col. 11, line 2, and col. 11, lines 4-20, 34-44, and 50-56, where a single prevailing rule is applied after subsequent prioritization iterations)

an act of dispatching the second SOAP envelope to the second group of one or more software methods specified by the single second prevailing rule (Thebaut, see, e.g., col. 3, lines 35-53; col. 14, lines 48 to col. 15, line 16; and col. 14, lines 48 to col. 15, line 16, where a dispatch is effected based on the single prevailing rule).

27. As per claim 19, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the single first prevailing rule is the same as the single second prevailing rule such that the first group of one or more software methods is the same as the second group of one or more software methods (Thebaut, e.g., see the methods and processing of column 4, lines 15-45 and col. 3, lines 35-60).

28. As per claim 20, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the single first prevailing rule is different than the single second prevailing rule and the first group of one or more software methods is different than the second group of one or

more software methods (Thebaut, e.g., see the methods and processing of column 4, lines 15-45 and col. 3, lines 35-60).

29. As per claim 21, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein one or more software methods in the first group of one or more software methods are also in the second group of one or more software methods (Thebaut, e.g., see the methods and processing of column 4, lines 15-45 and col. 3, lines 35-60, which include overlapping and non-overlapping groups of methods).

30. As per claim 22, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the group of one or more software methods are executed by the computing system (Thebaut, col. 3, lines 17-60, fig. 1, and col. 17, lines 7-45, where the methods are executed)

31. As per claim 23, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the computing system is a first computing system, the group of one or more software methods being executed by a second computing system that the first computing system is capable of communicating with over a network, the act of dispatching the SOAP envelope to the group of one or more software methods comprising the following: an act of sending the SOAP envelope to the second computing system over the network (Thebaut, col. 3, lines 17-60, fig. 1, col. 14, line 48 to col. 15, line 16, and col. 17, lines 7-45; where a deterministic rule-based dispatch is made to dispatch data to executable

software methods for processing that is located on a second computer system across a network).

32. As per claim 25, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the list or rules is expressed using XPATH statements (Kuznetsov, paragraphs 0028-0030).

33. As per claim 26, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the list or rules is expressed using XPATH statements (Kuznetsov, paragraphs 0028-0030).

34. As per claims 27 and 36, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further comprising: an act of accessing an instruction to amend the list of rules; and an act of automatically amending the list of rules in response to the instruction (Thebaut, see, e.g., col. 4, lines 35-54 including instructions to amend the list of rules).

35. As per claim 29, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the one or more computer-readable storage media comprise physical storage memory media (Thebaut, see, e.g., col. 17, lines 7-45; see also fig. 15).

36. As per claim 30, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the physical memory storage media comprises persistent memory (Thebaut, see, e.g., col. 17, lines 7-45; see also fig. 15).

37. As per claim 31, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the physical memory storage media comprises system memory (Thebaut, see, e.g., col. 17, lines 7-45; see also fig. 15).

38. As per claim 35, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein application of the first prioritization mechanism does not narrow the plurality of rules to the prevailing rule, the method further comprising the following: an act of continuing application of prioritization rules until the plurality of rules is narrowed down to just the prevailing rule (Thebaut, col. 4, lines 26-62, col. 10, line 59 to col. 11, line 2, and col. 11, lines 4-20, 34-44, and 50-65).

39. As per claim 37, Thebaut teaches a computing system that is capable of dispatching Simple Object Access Protocol envelope for processing by groups of one or more software methods, a method for the computing system to perform deterministic rule-based dispatch of the SOAP envelope to a group of one or more software methods for further processing, the dispatch being deterministic despite the existence of multiple rules that conflict regarding where the SOAP envelope should be dispatched, the method comprising the following: (Thebaut, col. 3, lines 17-60, fig. 1, and col. 17, lines 7-45; where a deterministic rule-based dispatch is made to dispatch data to executable software methods for processing, see also example dispatch of col. 14, line 48 to col. 15, line 16)

an act of receiving a SOAP envelope over a network, wherein the SOAP envelope is to be processed by one or more software methods; and (Thebaut, see, e.g., col. 3, lines 35-53 and col. 14, lines 48 to col. 15, line 16, where data is accessed/received over a network)

in response to receiving the SOAP envelope over the network, a step for using a list of rules to deterministically dispatch the SOAP envelope to a group of one or more software methods, wherein the list of rules specifies a condition and a group of one or more software methods the SOAP envelope is dispatched to if the condition is met, wherein the condition is at least one of (1) a structural characteristic of the SOAP envelope, (2) the content of the SOAP envelope, or (3) an environmental condition (Thebaut, col. 3, lines 18-60, col. 4, lines 1-25, figs. 1-col. 14, line 48 to col. 15, line 16 and fig. 1).

However, Thebaut fails to teach the use of the SOAP protocol.

Kuznetsov teaches the use of Simple Object Access Protocol envelopes (e.g., paragraph 0063, 0065, 0082, 0091, and 0142) and XPATH rule-based statements (paragraphs 0028-0030) in a network message processing system that relies on the use of rules (paragraph 0056).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Thebaut and Kuznetsov to provide the network system of Kuznetsov in the system of Thebaut, because doing so would allow efficient XML markup processing compatibility in a network rules system and widen the system format capabilities (e.g., see Kuznetsov paragraphs 0021-0023 and 0025). Further, the

use of SOAP processing can efficiently interconnect enterprise applications at a lower cost than conventional proprietary protocol solutions (see Kuznetsov, paragraph 0013).

40. As per claim 38, Thebaut-Kuznetsov teaches the system further wherein the step for using a list of rules to deterministically dispatch the SOAP envelope to a group of one or more software methods comprises the following:

an act of evaluating the list of rules to identify a plurality of rules consisting of only rules that apply to the dispatch of the SOAP envelope, each of the plurality of rules specifying a different group of one or more software methods to which the SOAP envelope should be dispatched; (Thebaut, col. 3, lines 45-60, col. 4, lines 1-25, figs. 1- col. 14, line 48 to col. 15, line 16)

an act of resolving the plurality of rules to identify a single prevailing rule that will be applied for the dispatch of the SOAP envelope, wherein only the single prevailing rule will be applied to the SOAP envelope and none of the other rules identified in the plurality of rules or the list of rules will be applied to the SOAP envelope; and (Thebaut, col. 4, lines 26-62, col. 10, line 59 to col. 11, line 2, and col. 11, lines 4-20, where a single prevailing rule is applied for dispatch after resolution)

an act of dispatching the SOAP envelope to only the group of one or more software methods specified by the single prevailing rule (Thebaut, see, e.g., col. 3, lines 35-53; col. 14, lines 48 to col. 15, line 16; and col. 14, lines 48 to col. 15, line 16, where a dispatch is effected based on the single prevailing rule).

41. As per claim 40, Thebaut teaches a computing system comprising the following:

one or more processors; system memory; one or more computer-readable storage media having stored thereon a list of rules, each rule specifying a condition and a group of one or more software methods that a SOAP envelope should be dispatched to if the condition is met, the one or more computer-readable storage media further having stored thereon computer-executable instructions that, when executed by the one or more processors, causes the computing system to instantiate in the system memory the following: (Thebaut, col. 3, lines 17-60, fig. 1, and col. 17, lines 7-45; where a deterministic rule-based dispatch is made to dispatch and executable software methods; see also example dispatch of col. 14, lines 48 to col. 15, line 16)

a comparison module configured to access a SOAP envelope that is to be dispatched to one or more software methods for processing and evaluate the list of rules to identify a plurality of rules that apply to the dispatch of the SOAP envelope; (Thebaut, col. 3, lines 45-60, col. 4, lines 1-25, figs. 1-col. 14, line 48 to col. 15, line 16)

a plurality of prioritization mechanisms configured to identify which conflicting rules take priority, each of the plurality of rules specifying a condition and a group of one or more software methods the SOAP envelope should be dispatched to if the condition is met, at least one of the prioritization mechanisms guarantying only one single prevailing rule will be applied to the dispatch of the SOAP envelope and that none of the other rules contained in the list of rules will be applied to the dispatch of the SOAP envelope; a resolution module configured to use the plurality of prioritization mechanisms to identify the single prevailing rule that will be applied for the dispatch of

the SOAP envelope to the one or more software methods specified in the single prevailing rule; and (Thebaut, col. 4, lines 26-62, col. 10, line 59 to col. 11, line 2, and col. 11, lines 4-20, where a single prevailing rule is applied for dispatch after resolution; see also col. 6, line 49 to col. 7, line 28 and fig. 6 architecture describing some of the triggers that engages conflict resolution)

a dispatching mechanism configured to dispatch the SOAP envelope to only the group of one or more software methods specified by the one prevailing rule (Thebaut, see, e.g., col. 3, lines 35-53; col. 14, lines 48 to col. 15, line 16; and col. 14, lines 48 to col. 15, line 16, where a dispatch is effected based on the single prevailing rule).

However, Thebaut fails to teach the use of the SOAP protocol.

Kuznetsov teaches the use of Simple Object Access Protocol envelopes (e.g., paragraph 0063, 0065, 0082, 0091, and 0142) and XPATH rule-based statements (paragraphs 0028-0030) in a network message processing system that relies on the use of rules (paragraph 0056).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have combined Thebaut and Kuznetsov to provide the network system of Kuznetsov in the system of Thebaut, because doing so would allow efficient XML markup processing compatibility in a network rules system and widen the system format capabilities (e.g., see Kuznetsov paragraphs 0021-0023 and 0025). Further, the use of SOAP processing can efficiently interconnect enterprise applications at a lower cost than conventional proprietary protocol solutions (see Kuznetsov, paragraph 0013).

Conclusion

42. Applicant's amendment necessitated any new grounds of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas Taylor whose telephone number is (571) 272-3889. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00am to 5:30pm, with alternating Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/NT/
Nicholas Taylor
Examiner
Art Unit 2441

/Larry D Donaghue/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2454